



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 16, 2005

Mr. Scott Brumley
Potter County Attorney
500 South Fillmore Street, Room 303
Amarillo, Texas 79101

OR2005-04195

Dear Mr. Brumley:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 224234.

The Potter County Attorney's Office and the Potter County Sheriff's Office (collectively, the "county") each received a request for twenty categories of information related to a named individual, and the policies of the Sheriff's Office applicable during the individual's incarceration in 2004. You state that you have released a portion of the requested information to the requestor. You also state that you have no responsive information regarding a portion of the request. We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of representative samples.¹

¹ We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note that a portion of Exhibit 6 is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides that

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibit 6 contains completed evaluations made of, for, or by the county. A completed evaluation must be released under section 552.022(a)(1), unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under other law. Although you claim that this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, we note that these exceptions to disclosure are discretionary exceptions to disclosure under the Act that do not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.² Accordingly, we conclude that the county may not withhold any portion of this information, which we have marked, under either section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the attorney work product privilege is also found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 337 (Tex. 2001). The Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, however, only apply to "actions of a civil nature." TEX. R. CIV. P. 2. Accordingly, rule 192.5 does not apply to the criminal matter at issue here and no portion of the information at issue may be withheld on this basis. As the county claims no other exceptions for this information, the completed evaluations must be released.

We now address your section 552.103 claim with regard to the remaining submitted information. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or

² Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or which implicate the interests of third parties. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (attorney work product privilege may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Discretionary exceptions, therefore, do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The county has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The county must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state that the county received a Notice of Claim in compliance with the TTCA, which alleges negligence on the part of the county with respect to the incarceration and death while incarcerated of the individual at issue. You inform us that the county received the Notice of Claim prior to receiving the present request for information. Therefore, we conclude that the county reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present requests for information. We also find that the remaining submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation. Thus, section 552.103(a) is applicable to the remaining submitted information.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further,

the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982). In this instance, it appears that the opposing party has had access to some of the requested records. Accordingly, while most of the remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103, any information that has been previously seen by the opposing party may not be withheld under this exception, and must be released to the requestor.

In summary, the county must release the completed evaluations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of any information previously obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation, the county may withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 224234

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeff Edwards
Whitehurst, Harkness, Ozmun & Brees
P.O. Box 1892
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)